IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated:- 26.06.2006

Coram:-

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice P.SATHASIVAM

and

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice V.DHANAPALAN

Habeas Corpus Petition No.333 of 2006

Manohari ... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Chennai-9.

2.The District Magistrate and
District Collector,
Nagapattinam District
Nagapattinam. ... Respondents

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records of the second respondent herein in C.O.C.No.4 of 2006 dated 02.03.2006, quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents to produce the detenu Gandhi son of Arasan, who now confined in Central Prison, Tiruchirapalli before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Gandhikumar
For Respondents : Mr.M.Babu Muthu Meeran
Addl. Public Prosecutor

WEB COPY

O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by P.SATHASIVAM,J.)

The petitioner, who is the wife of the detenu by name Gandhi, who is detained as a ''Goonda" as contemplated under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

Act 14 of 1982), by the impugned detention order dated 02.03.2006, challenges the same in this Petition.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondents.

3. At the foremost, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is enormous delay in disposal of the representation of the detenu, which vitiates the ultimate order of detention. With reference to the above claim, learned Additional Public Prosecutor has placed the details, which show that the representation of the detenu dated 15.03.2006 was received by the Government on 17.03.2006 and the remarks were called for on the same day i.e. on 17.03.2006 and the remarks were received by the Government on 27.03.2006 and the File was submitted on 30.03.2006 and the same was dealt with by the Under Secretary and the Deputy Secretary on the same day i.e. on 30.03.2006 and finally, the Minister for Prohibition and Excise passed orders on 31.03.2006. The rejection letter was prepared on 10.04.2006 and the same was sent to the detenu on 12.04.2006 and served to him on 15.04.2006. As rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the Minister for Prohibition and Excise passed an order on 31.03.2006, there is no explanation at all for taking time for preparation of rejection letter till 10.04.2006. In the absence of any explanation by the person concerned even after excluding the intervening holidays, we are of the view that the time taken for preparation of rejection letter is on the higher side and we hold that the said delay has prejudiced the detenu in disposal of his representation. On this ground, we quash the impugned order of detention.

4. Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned order of detention is set aside. The detenu is directed to be set at liberty forthwith from the custody unless he is required in some other case or cause.

Sd/-
Asst. Registrar.

WEB COPY

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar.

raa

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

To

1.The Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Magistrate and District Collector, Nagapattinam District, Nagapattinam.

3. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Tiruchirapalli.
(In duplicate for communication to detenu)

4. The Joint Secretary to Government, Public (Law and Order)
Fort St. George, Chennai-9.

5. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.

HCP. No.333 of 2006

TEJ (CO)
kk 30/6

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/